

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, APRIL 8, 1911

No. 23

In a recent editorial (4145) reference was made, incidentally, to a booklet by Professor Charles Mills Gayley, Professor of English in the University of California. The book, entitled *Idols of Education*, and published by Doubleday, Page & Co. (1910), is most entertaining and suggestive. The main points of the book had been made by Professor Gayley in a Commencement Oration, delivered at Ann Arbor in June, 1909. From an abstract of the Oration, published in *The Michigan Alumnus*, in July, 1909, one gets an even clearer idea of Professor Gayley's views than he does from the book; the concentration of the address makes for clearness and precision. Professor Gayley is well known as a loyal friend of the Classics; witness the address issued by him and Professor W. A. Merrill, Professor of Latin at the University of California, to the teachers of English and Latin throughout California (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 373), urging them to support Greek. Professor Gayley has published also an excellent book, entitled *Classic Myths in English Literature* (Ginn and Co.), now in its second edition.

From the report of the Commencement Oration in *The Michigan Alumnus* come the following quotations:

Education is to enjoy the best and produce the best as well as to know the best. How can one enjoy without knowing; how can one produce in the freedom of self-realization, without enjoying? What was it Fletcher of Saltoun said? The songs of a nation, the poetry of a nation, the music of a nation, the art of a nation, the history of a nation, the ideals of a nation, aye, and of the world,—these are the joy of life, these the impulse to law and conduct and discovery and creation and patriotism and religion. Without the humanities what man can be educated, what vocation is more than a meal check?

Especially downtrodden of men is our heritage from antiquity. Man will always be the heir of all the ages. To satisfy him with the heritage of a recent yesterday, the modern languages and literature, modern history and poetry and economics strive in vain. He remains the child of the ages, but a child deprived of his full heritage.

The appreciation of English and of all modern literature depends upon a first-hand acquaintance with Greek and Latin classics. The knowledge of the history of institutions and of art depends upon a knowledge of the classics. A knowledge of philosophy depends upon a knowledge of the classics. Equipment for liberal scholarship of any kind depends upon a knowledge of the classics. No better

training in logical processes was ever devised than the philological discipline of the classics, no discipline more thoroughly systematized, more uniform, more definite, more rigorous. No better training in the use of one's own language than translation from the classics. No better school of poetry or of oratory than the classics. No better gallery of lives,—which to contemplate is to know that virtue is its own reward and vice its own penalty.

The neglect of the humanities is traceable largely to the pedagogical doctrine of the equivalence of studies. This is an idol of Caprice. There is no equivalence of studies in discipline or in informational value for life. The humanities and the sciences train faculties the same, or different, in different combinations and in different degrees. They impart information that has different values for life, or that is appropriate to different callings in life.

But even in the matter of discipline, it is essential that the mental machine be trained to run not in one rut but in the several grooves "of procedure needful in the main division of the world of mind". And of these procedures that which demands mental concentration in the highest degree develops best the ability to grapple mentally and morally with the manifold problems of life. That which is capable, because of long centuries of educational experience, of conveying a discipline most nearly uniform is most to be desired in the training of the youth of a democratic republic. From this point of view we do not surrender the theory of the superiority of the discipline afforded by the humanities.

... From the schools the cry is heard, "The universities require too much already". "How do more than we can?" The universities do not require too much nor so much as, in the near future, they will require. The schools are trying not much but many things. They can do more by trying less. Less number and variety of studies, less dawdling over them, less futile and mortal repetition, less subdivision into arbitrary cabins and compartments and two-inch treads of knowledge, less fear of overtaxing the memory, less coddling of the child, less experimentation with half-fledged theories of pedagogy, and with fads that are the source of laughter to gods and men; less spelling of words without syllables, and of syllables without letters; less baby arithmetic and ten-year-old arithmetic and fifteen-year-old arithmetic. Less partial payments, discounts and calculations on stocks and bonds for budding citizens who do not aspire to Wall Street; less encyclopedic jumble of geography; less literary criticism and more grammar. At least two or three less of the weary repetitions of United States history. Fewer different kinds of effort, in other words, and more intellectual effort on the part of the child. Some accuracy in something.

It is the opinion of our most able superintendents of schools that reform is impossible until we have

more competent teachers. At present we are chopping wood with a dull axe. But instead of grinding the axe we step aside to chew tobacco and theorize. Teachers, when incompetent, are so principally because they are ignorant. Our theorists are to blame. They try to dissipate the ignorance of teachers, not by teaching them one thing which they shall teach, but by teaching them how to teach all things that they do not know.

I have the profoundest respect for historians and philosophers of education, themselves learned men in special fields . . . like the late Professors Payne and Hinsdale, and the Hon. William T. Harris, and the heads of educational departments in some of our great universities, but the sciolists who, ignorant of any art or science, dabble in all,—who walk up and down through our schools, prating of the science of education, as if there were yet any such science, and tempting aside the learner from learning what is tried and fast in the subject that he would teach (be it history or Latin or English), to the pursuit of so-called laws, principles, methods, not yet concurred in by the wise, not yet possible to be derived from facts not yet ascertained, still less observed and systematized,—such sciolists do not command respect. We have sympathy for the poor girl whose instructor in pedagogy advised her to drop Greek and take Ventilation of the School Room. "I came to college to get an education", she replied, "not to get a teacher's certificate". . . . Most of the methods and theories of the sciolists are fallacies of ignorance or personal conceit—what Bacon calls idols of the Cave. They waste the time of the earnest student; they delude the incompetent into a profession that demands not so much method as scholarship and innate aptitude; and they bewilder the schools with a maze of fallacies and ridiculous fads.

C. K.

#### ROBERT HERRICK: THE ENGLISH HORACE

Robert Herrick has been styled by his critics, in their few sweeping generalizations about his classical learning, now the wearer of the vine-wreath of Anacreon, now the English Catullus, now a Martial. Moreover, besides these attempts to identify his personality with one or another of the old pagans, incidental references have been made to reminiscences in his verses of Ovid, Tibullus, Vergil, and Horace. But the longest discussions of his indebtedness to his classical predecessors (Mr. Edmund Gosse's account of his "antique sources", Dr. Alexander Grosart's pages on his "allusive reading"), have failed to point out Herrick's greatest debt. Gosse busies himself with disproving "a foolish statement that all the editors of Herrick have repeated, sheep-like, from one another, namely, that Catullus was his great example and model", maintaining that "in reality it would be difficult to name a lyric poet with whom he has less in common than with the Veronese, whose eagle-flights into the very noonday depths of passion, swifter than Shelley's, as flaming as Sappho's, have no sort of fellowship with the pipings of our gentle and luxurious babblers by the flowery brooks". And he goes on to declare that "no one carefully reading the Hesperides can fail to be struck with the extraordinary

similarity they bear to the Epigrams of Martial, and the parallel will be found to run throughout the writings of the two poets, for good and for bad". Grosart is occupied with combating both of Gosse's comparisons, declaring that "the *Carmina* of Catullus, alike in their lyrical fervour and intensity, find more than 'fellowship' in much of the *Hesperides*", that "for once that Martial is suggested, Catullus is three times", and that "more than this—it is in the offensive Epigrams that had better be spared bodily that Herrick goes to Martial". Now each of these critics is expressing at least half a truth, for Herrick not only had something in his temperament which responded to the verve and thrill of Catullus's love-poetry, so that it was easy for him to imitate Catullus's *Epithalamia* and his poems on Lesbia's kisses and Lesbia's sparrow, but he was also temperamentally akin to Martial in a certain coarse animalism and power of pungent satire which made him imitate the Roman's epigrams<sup>1</sup>. But the versatile Englishman easily turned off also Eclogues after Vergil and light verses inspired by the charming Greek Anacreontics. Yet his poetry was not predominantly colored by the one or the other. Far larger than to any of these was his debt to Horace; far more akin was he temperamentally to Horace than to Anacreon or Vergil, Catullus or Martial. This I hope to prove by showing certain interesting parallelisms between the lives and tastes of Herrick and Horace and by pointing out how much of direct allusion to Horace and imitation of him there is in Herrick's poetry.

A brief review of the lives of the two poets may serve as a basis of comparison. Robert Herrick was born in 1591 of a family that dated back to the time of Henry the Third. In 1592 his father died suddenly. Herrick's mother lived until 1620. In 1607, he was bound apprentice for ten years to his uncle, a goldsmith, but apparently the contract was broken, as he was at Cambridge in 1613. He remained there until 1620, first at St. John's, then at Trinity; from this period fourteen letters are extant, written to his guardian uncle, virtually all on one theme, begging for speedy remittances from his tiny inheritance, and showing the financial straits in which the young man was placed during his university career. The years 1620-1629 were spent in London and it was in this period that Herrick knew Ben Jonson well. In the year 1629, the year in which his mother died, the poet turned priest and after taking orders received the living of Dean Prior in Devonshire. Even before he went to Dean Prior he had written verses and in 1635 he first appears in print anonymously in a booklet of poems on fairies. Also when *Wit's Recreations* appeared in 1640, there were included in it sixty-two of the

<sup>1</sup> See an article on Herrick and Martial by Professor Paul N. Classical Philology, 5.189-202.

poems published afterwards in the *Hesperides*. As poet and preacher, Herrick continued in his living until the time of the Commonwealth. In 1647 he lost his parish and returned to London with unconcealed delight. Almost immediately, 1647-1648, he published the fruit of his past years' labors, the *Hesperides* and *Noble Numbers*. Much of the rest of his life is buried in oblivion, but it is certain that he returned to Dean Prior in 1662 and remained there until his death in 1674, obscure and unknown.

Quintus Horatius Flaccus, born in 65 B.C., was the son of a freedman who was a collector of taxes. Nothing is known of his mother, but the freedman father played an important part in the poet's life, as he gratefully acknowledges. While Horace was studying Greek literature and philosophy at Athens, Brutus came there, after the death of Caesar, and enlisted Horace among others of the Roman students for the struggle at Philippi. When the Republican cause was lost in that battle, Horace returned to Rome to find his father dead and his father's farm confiscated by Octavian. These were his dark days when without friends and virtually penniless he supported himself as a quaestor's clerk. But they did not last long, for the poetry which he began to write caught the attention of Vergil and Varius, who introduced him to Maecenas. In 33 B.C., that great patron of literature presented Horace with a small farm in the Sabine hills which gave him the means of support, a charming country home, and leisure to write. From this time until his death in 8 B.C., he divided his time between Rome and the country, leading a life rich in friendships and creative work.

A comparison of the facts of these two lives shows at once, along with certain differences, striking similarities. The parentage of the two men was very unlike, since, while Herrick had a flourishing family tree, Horace was the son of a man who had been a slave. Virtually nothing is known of the relations of the poets and their mothers, as Herrick refers to his mother but once and Horace makes no mention of his, but Horace was more fortunate than Herrick in having his father for his companion and moral guide up to about his nineteenth year. Both poets had excellent educations, the best that the time could offer and rich in literary study. Each went through a period of financial worry, Herrick while he was a university student, Horace while he was serving as a quaestor's clerk. Each too had a period of uncongenial labor, Herrick as apprentice to a goldsmith, Horace as a copyist or *scriba*. Both were indebted to patrons for moral and financial support and expressed that debt in verses, Herrick to the Earl of Pembroke and to Endymion Porter, among others, Horace to Maecenas. The environments of the lives of the

two poets show also interesting parallels, divided as both were between the city and the country. Herrick was in London from 1620-1629 and again from 1647-1662, enjoying to the full the life of the city, especially Jonson's literary circle. Horace spent in Rome the period of his early education and the time of his secretaryship and during the rest of his life was there often as an honored guest in Maecenas's palace on the Esquiline, one of that literary circle whose friendly spirit and happy mood he so genially records.

Both poets have left in their verses records of their lives in the country, but records colored with very different feeling, for Herrick openly expressed his dislike of Dean Prior while Horace had an intense love for his Sabine farm. It was on his departure from "dull" and "loathed" Devonshire that Herrick wrote the following poems<sup>2</sup>.

London my home is: though by hard fate sent  
Into a long and irksome banishment;  
Yet since cal'd back; henceforward let me be,  
O native country, repossess by thee!  
For, rather than I'll to the West return,  
I'll beg of thee first here to have my Urn.  
Weak I am grown, and must in short time fall;  
Give thou my sacred Reliques Buriall.

The next is "to Dean-bourn, a rude River in Devon".

Dean-bourn, farewell; I never look to see  
Deane, or thy watry incivility,  
Thy rockie bottome, that doth teare thy streams,  
And makes them frantick, ev'n to all extreames;  
To my content, I never sho'd behold,  
Were thy streames silver, or thy rocks all gold.  
Rockie thou art and rockie we discover  
Thy men; and rockie are thy ways all over.  
O men, o manners; there and ever knowne  
To be a Rockie Generation!  
A people currish, churlish as the seas,  
And rude (almost) as rudest Savages:  
With whom I did, and may re-sojourn when  
Rockes turn to Rivers, Rivers turn to Men.

Horace's descriptions of his Sabine farm are written in a very different tone. Indeed the keynote of them might be his own phrase, *satis beatus unicus Sabinis*<sup>3</sup>. He tells how the spot is surrounded by mountains, broken only by vistas that admit glimpses of the rising and the setting sun; how oak and ilex give him their shade, how a spring of pure water is near<sup>4</sup>, and how over the villa towers tall pine, dedicated to Diana, guardian of mountains and of groves<sup>5</sup>. This is really the land of his heart's desire, for he avows, "This was ever in my prayers: a plot of ground, not large, where there should be a garden, a spring near the house, and a bit of woodland", and he adds gratefully, "The gods have blessed me even beyond this. All is well. I ask for nothing more".

Different as they are in their view-points of

<sup>2</sup> 2. 233; 1. 48. The references are to the complete *Poems of Robert Herrick*, edited by A. B. Grosart.

<sup>3</sup> C. 2. 18. 14. <sup>4</sup> Epp. 1. 16. 1-16. <sup>5</sup> C. 3. 22.



Dean Prior and the Sabine farm, Herrick and Horace give many details of their life in the country which show surprisingly similar tastes and interests. Each had a favorite servant who appeared in his verse. Herrick's homely and cozy little verses Upon Prudence Baldwin show genuine affection for the maid "by good luck sent":

These Summer-Birds did with thy master stay  
The times of warmth; but then they flew away;  
Leaving their Poet (being now grown old)  
Expos'd to all the coming Winters cold.  
But thou, kind Prew, did'st with my fates abide,  
As well the Winters, as the Summers Tide:  
For which thy love, live with thy master here  
Not one, but all the seasons of the year<sup>8</sup>.

The epitaph written after her death is exquisite:

In this little Urne is laid  
Prewdence Baldwin (once my maid),  
From whose happy spark here let  
Spring the purple Violet<sup>9</sup>.

Horace's slave Davus is not the subject of delicate lyrics, but is Horace's interlocutor in a *Sermo* cast in the form of a dialogue<sup>10</sup>, who uses the freedom of speech which Roman slaves enjoyed at the Saturnalia to criticise frankly his master. The slave's shrewd comments on Horace's inconsistencies and lack of moral freedom make him an interesting character and the picture of the relation between him and his master shows the greatest friendliness.

Neither Herrick nor Horace ever married, a fact which conditioned much of the nature of their country life besides explaining a certain philandering in their poetry. Herrick's love lyrics are addressed to Julia, Silvia, Perilla, Perenna, Anthea, Lucia, Biancha, Corinna, and Dianeme; in Horace's Odes appear Lydia, Leuconoe, Glycera, Chloe, Barine, Asterie, Lyce, Lyde, Tyndaris, Phyllis, and Cinara. For both poets there seemed to be a safety in numbers and their verse is none the less exquisite because it is so far removed from intense passion. And surely Herrick in these gay trifles to many maids is more of a philandering Horace than an ardent Catullus who poured out his heart to one name.

Both poets had a lively interest in the country people who lived near them and in the country rites. Herrick describes May-pole dances and early morning maying, Harvest Home and Hock-cart, Wassails and Wakes, Christmas revellings

and Holydayes  
On which the young men and maids meet  
To exercise their dancing feet:  
Tripping the comely country Round,  
With Daffadils and Daisies crowned<sup>11</sup>.

Horace tells of his country neighbor coming in to dinner and entertaining him with the fable of the country and the city mouse<sup>12</sup>, describes too such country ceremonies as the Faunalia, when the whole countryside turns out into the grassy

meadows to make holiday and even the hard-worked ditch-digger dances on the hated earth<sup>13</sup>.

Both Herrick and Horace delighted in flowers and Herrick's pages are full of the color of primroses, daffodils, violets, pansies, roses, lilies, while Horace is suited in one mood by the simple myrtle, in another loves the flowers of the rose, all too short-lived. Both poets watched and enjoyed animals, but Horace gives no such list of pets as Herrick enumerates. He gives rather pictures of animals intended for sacrifice, little tawny calf with white spot on its forehead, or by some flash-light simile shows a startled fawn standing by its mother in the trackless forest.

In addition to these points of resemblance in their private life, the attitudes of the poets towards certain large questions of the times suggest comparisons. Both lived in a period of political revolution. Herrick was consistently a royalist in spite of the Commonwealth and manifested in his poems thorough admiration of the Charleses as well as sorrow over the trouble in the Kingdom. Horace fought on the side of the Republic at Philippi, showed in his poetry keen admiration for Cato Uticensis, "the last of the Republicans", and only gradually became reconciled to the new regime of imperial rule under the tactful influence of Maecenas and his own witnessing of the blessings of peace for the nation, but his poems in praise of Augustus and his step-sons are at the last as completely enthusiastic as those of Herrick to the English monarchs.

In their attitude towards religion, the two poets seem at first very far apart, for Horace had nothing of the priest about him and in the poems that most directly voice his views seems to be a rationalist in his attitude towards the supernatural, but there is surely something of the same conventional tone in the distinctly religious poems of the two men. Herrick's Noble Numbers are trite in church phrasology, cold and labored, written under the depression of the cloth. Horace's hymns to the gods are ceremonial and aesthetically beautiful, but untouched by deep religious emotion, indeed are distinctly felt to be in formal support of Augustus's policy of revival of the old Roman religion. A still broader resemblance between the two men appears in the kinds of poetry which they wrote. Herrick's verses fall into three groups: pure lyrics, satirical epigrams, and the religious pieces entitled Noble Numbers. Horace's work consists of lyrics (The Odes), 'satires', some of which might roughly correspond in tone to Herrick's epigrams, and the epistles, many of which are philosophical in character and as distinctly a different field for Horace as were the Noble Numbers for Herrick.

Such are the resemblances between the facts of the

<sup>8</sup> 2.80-81. <sup>9</sup> 2.268. <sup>10</sup> *Serm.* 2.7. <sup>11</sup> 2.214. <sup>12</sup> *Serm.* 2.

<sup>13</sup> *C.* 3.18.

two poets' lives, the features of their temperaments, the style of their work. More certain proof of Herrick's literary kinship to Horace may be found in his actual indebtedness to Horace's poetry—a debt varying from acknowledged translation of whole ode to chance phrase or word in solution in his verse.

Familiar is Herrick's rendering of A dialogue betwix't Horace and Lydia. In theme eminently suited to Herrick's own genius, this light-hearted lovers' quarrel receives graceful and charming treatment at his hands and his four line strophe, in spite of its rhyming couplets, produces not unsuccessfully the effect of the original. Another poem which shows conspicuous Horatian influence is typical of Herrick's method of using his prototype. This is the one on his age, dedicated to his peculiar friend, Mr. John Wickes, under the name of Posthumous. Seven of the first stanzas of this poem contain imitations of Horace. In the first, besides the name Posthumous, the first four lines are taken from Horace, C. 2. 14. 1-4:

Ah Posthumous! Our years hence flye  
And leave no sound; nor piety,  
Or prayers, or vow  
Can keep the wrinkle from the brow.

The last two lines are from another ode, I. 28. 19-20:

None, Posthumous, co'd ere decline  
The doome of cruel Proserpine.

The second stanza returns to C. 2. 14. 21-24, the first three lines being virtually direct translation:

The pleasing wife, the house, the ground  
Must all be left, no one plant found  
To follow thee  
Save only the Curst-Cipresse tree.

The third and fourth stanzas have imbibed part of C. 4. 7:

We see the Seas  
And moons to wain;  
But they fill up their ebbs again:  
But vanisht, man  
Like to a Lilly-lost, nere can,  
Nere can, repullulate, or bring  
His dayes to see a second spring.  
But on we must, and thither tend,  
Where Anchus and rich Tullus blend  
Their sacred seed.

The fifth stanza is indebted to C. 2. 11 for  
Crown we our Heads with Roses then,  
And 'noint with Tirian Balm.

The sixth stanza owes the "roofs of Cedar" and Baiae to C. 2. 18. The "shining salt-seller" of the next stanza comes from C. 2. 16 and the line "We'll eate our Beane" surely is a reminiscence of Horace's famous bean that was the kinsman of Pythagoras and helped to make a feast fit for gods. Here then in seven stanzas of one poem are seven quotations from Horace or allusions to his poetry.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT.  
(To be concluded.)

## REVIEW

Cicero's Letters. Selected and edited by Ernst Riess.  
New York: The Macmillan Co. (1910). Pp.  
59 + 396. 60 cents.

This book is intended for freshmen. It belongs to a series which undertakes to combat the temptation of translations by furnishing such commentaries on the Latin works read in colleges as younger students require for the interpretation of the text, without the usual erudite or pedantic superfluities that only bewilder the undergraduate. Dr. Riess urges the reading of Cicero's letters by freshmen on the ground that "after the mainly grammatical treatment of Latin in the secondary school, the students need most to be awakened to the fact that the Roman authors were men of flesh and blood". He believes that the students' acquaintance with the Ciceronian Age gives a *πρὸς στῶ*. It would be easy to add other reasons, but perhaps no considerations will entirely remove the prejudice in favor of beginning the college course with some formal prose work. Dr. Riess's book is made up of 49 pages of introduction, 267 pages of text, and 120 pages of notes. There are, besides, tables showing the traditional numbering of each letter of the selection and an index of important proper names.

The amount of text included is so large (more letters are given than in Watson's ponderous volume) that the instructor will be called upon to make a further selection for himself—perhaps not so much a burden as an opportunity. It is between seven and eight times as great as the text of the Cato Maior, nearly twice as great as the combined twenty-first and twenty-second books of Livy. Of the 166 letters, 44 are from the collection Ad Atticum, two from the Ad Quintum Fratrem group. In the selections from the Ad Familiares there are twenty letters from fourteen writers other than Cicero, and letters from Cicero to thirty-five different persons. It will be inferred from these figures that the various sides of Cicero's correspondence are well represented, and a closer examination of the contents of the book will justify the inference. Dr. Riess has made his choice with discrimination and discretion. Occasionally, indeed, one may disagree with him: for instance, regarding Quint. Frat. 1.1. If the length and the style of this letter do not constitute a sufficient objection to including it in such a selection, then perhaps the similar essay-letter of Quintus, the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, ought also to have been given a place. The order of the letters is, of course, chronological.

The introduction treats these subjects: History of Letter-writing down to the Time of Cicero, Cicero's Letters (with brief biographies of his correspondents of his own household, and of Atticus, Caelius, and Trebatius), The Extant Collection, Writing a Letter in Antiquity, Language and Style

of the Letters, Chronology of Cicero's Life. This part of the book is supposedly intended, like the rest, for the student, not the teacher or scholar. The last two sections gather up into a coherent whole explanations and remarks scattered through the notes, and will be used only to bring out the general relations and significance of particular facts. The other sections must be capable of being read uninterruptedly and understandingly, if they are to do their part in interesting our freshman in classical antiquity. On the whole, this requirement is satisfied, but occasionally the way is blocked by a piece of erudition or disappears where some of the steps of an argument have been sacrificed to a desire for brevity.

The discussion of the publication of the *Epistulae ad Familiares* is not convincing, because of the omission of arguments which would have made the editor's reasoning plain. The conclusion that Book XV was not published with Books I-IX (and XIV and XVI) is rendered suspect by the statement concerning the dates of its letters, and no other reason for the separation is offered. Furthermore, mention of the fact that Tiro lived many years after the probable date of the appearance of the first collection is not the best foundation for a statement that a later editor collected Books X-XII. This is not the place to enter into the whole question, and I should not animadvert upon Dr. Riess's conclusions if they were given without argument or were consistent with the argument.

In what is said of the *sermo cotidianus* on pages xxxvii and xxxviii there are traces of the old confusion between the conversational speech of the cultured and the *sermo plebeius*. The treatment of the style of the letters shows something, too, of the almost universal tendency (even among reviewers) to overestimate the peculiarities of any style that happens to be under discussion. For instance, *sentina urbis*, *locus* (from the arena), and *quasi de caelo delapsus*, which are given as examples of Cicero's epistolary use of metaphor and comparison, are all found in the same figurative uses in the orations read in school. Indeed, most of the examples cited under this head can be duplicated or paralleled from formal prose. The metaphorical use of gladiatorial terms no more indicates colloquial Latin than "countered Marcellus's bill" (p. li) indicates colloquial English.

A great school was once happily characterized as a place where boys were taught to read the preface of a book. Nowadays students do not read even the introduction, and the usefulness of such a book as this depends almost entirely upon the nature of the notes. Dr. Riess tells us in his preface that his notes are elementary, and this they are in the main, as well as commendably rare and brief. There are, as in the foot-notes of the intro-

duction, a few references to learned German works not likely to be at the freshman's elbow or intelligible to him. On the other hand, a large proportion of the references to Latin literature are to works read in the schools. This constant backward look has possibilities of good that are usually neglected by editors. The scattered grammatical references take account only of Gildersleeve-Lodge. Where Dr. Riess forgoes comment, little is lost that cannot be made good by the teacher *viva voce*. One may perhaps even regret that he has not left somewhat more to the discretion of the individual teacher. Some surely would prefer that the student's attention should not be distracted by the identification of persons whose very names he will soon forget: e. g., in Att. 1.1, Cornificius, Caesonius, Aufidius, Palicanus.

There is some loose writing in the book, of which the following are extreme instances: "These are distinguished even by the superscription, which in the case of confidential correspondence gives merely the cognomen of the addressee, and is free and easy both in tone and content. It employs the *sermo cotidianus*" (p. xv); "which called forth the famous letter on the administration of provinces by his brother" (p. xxi); "at the risk of his life on the part of the aristocratic hotspurs" (p. liii). Various other faults of diction, evidently due in part to haste, should be corrected when an opportunity offers. To say that they tried to carry the war into Africa (p. liii) seems peculiarly inappropriate in its application of the proverb to the Pompeian remnant.

I add some random observations. Throughout the book letters are referred to by their traditional number, instead of their number in the selection, and this entails unnecessary labor upon those who would make use of the references. Some of the foot-notes (for instance, on pp. xiv and xv) are confused and confusing. Is it not too far a cry from the letters to Tiro to the conclusion that Cicero was "a kind friend of the lowly, the slaves, and freedmen" (p. xvii)? The *stilus* is not clearly described as a "copper pencil" (p. xxxiii). On p. xxxix there is a reference to a non-existent section 17 of Fam. 15.4. On p. xl reference is made to Fam. 9.9.2 for two accusatives after a verb of asking, but the reading in the text is *a te peto* after Cratander, not *te peto* with the manuscripts (the editor scrupulously avoids all discussion of textual questions). The statement that Cicero was made proconsul of Cilicia and the neighboring provinces (p. 1) is misleading. What is meant is that the limits of the province extended beyond Cilicia proper. The date of Att. 3.4 is 58, not 59.

S. (p. 269) is a late abbreviation of *Sextus*. The extraordinary use of the names of the consuls in



Att. 1.2 should have been explained or left entirely unnoticed. Is there any warrant for saying that the formal salutation of Fam. 5.7 was officially prescribed? *Tres viri* is certainly not to be understood as the subject of *inimici erant*, Att. 2.19.3. The tense of *essent*, Fam. 14.4.4, is not influenced by *abisset*, but both forms are determined by the idea of past time implied in *causa est*. The statement (p. 302) that the ancients never read "in our soundless way" is, to say the least, too sweeping. Only the tense of *abundares*, Fam. 7.10.2, is influenced by *placebat*; its mood would be subjunctive if the clause were direct. Of the *Ampius* of Fam. 3.7.5 it is said: "He had been proconsul of Asia, but may have had authority in a few Cilician towns". Is he not the praetor of De Domo 23 (*Cilicium ad praetorem extra ordinem transtulisti*)? I cannot see in Fam. 16.1.1 any light on ancient medicine. Tiro seems to have been suffering from a disorder of the stomach, as Dr. Riess says, and Cicero complains in a later letter (Fam. 16.4) that soup had been given him by his physician. The words in 16.1 are best taken as referring to the retention of food by the stomach; they do not, in any case, necessarily imply a prolonged fast. Furthermore, it gives a one-sided impression to say that ancient medicine "cured illness largely by fasting or a very spare diet". Is not Fam. 4.5 the only extant letter of condolence on the death of Tullia? Fam. 5.14 might possibly be counted as another, but Dr. Riess's language implies that several such letters are extant. The note which explains *qui illius*, Fam. 4.5.6, as equivalent to *is enim* will be a hindrance to the understanding of the passage, rather than a help.

THE PHILIPS EXETER ACADEMY.

JOHN C. KIRTLAND.

### THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

The programme of the annual meeting is as follows:

Friday Afternoon, April 21, at 2.30.

In McCosh Hall 10

Address of Welcome, by Professor Henry B. Fine, Dean of the University Faculty.

Response, by Mr. J. B. Hench, President of the Association.

Paper: Greek Medicine and the Cure-Inscriptions from Epidaurus, by Professor G. M. Whicher, Normal College, New York City.

Paper: A Witticism of Asinius Pollio, by Professor G. L. Hendrickson, of Yale University.

Paper: The Authorship of the Forcellini Lexicon, by Professor Charles E. Bennett, of Cornell University.

Paper: Preparatory Classics, by Professor Hamilton Ford Allen, of Washington and Jefferson College.

Recess (10 minutes).

Report of the Executive Committee; Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

At 6.30, Dinner at the Princeton Inn. (\$1.00 per plate).

At the Dinner speeches will be made by President Patton, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, and Dean Andrew F. West, of Princeton University, Professor John C. Rolfe, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor Edward Delavan Perry, of Columbia University.

Friday Evening, April 21, at 9

In McCosh Hall 10

Greetings from The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, by Professor Frank J. Miller, of the University of Chicago.

Greetings from The Classical Association of New England, by Professor G. L. Hendrickson, of Yale University.

Paper (illustrated): The Roman Wall in Britain, by Professor John H. Westcott, of Princeton University.

Saturday Morning, April 22, at 9.30

In Murray Hall

Paper: Decimus Magnus Ausonius, by Miss Anna Pearl MacVay, of The Wadleigh High School, New York City.

Round Table: Discussion of Topics suggested by members. The members of the Association are requested to send to the Secretary as soon as possible questions they would like to hear discussed at the meeting. From these a selection will be made, and speakers will be secured, as far as possible, to open the various discussions.

Election of Officers; General Business.

At 1.30, Luncheon, for Members and Visitors, given by Princeton University, in University Hall.

Saturday Afternoon, at 3

In McCosh Hall 10

Paper: The Lyric Mood, by Professor Frank J. Miller, of the University of Chicago.

Paper (illustrated): Life of the Ancient Greeks, by Professor D. M. Robinson, of the Johns Hopkins University.

Paper: *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, by Dr. Edgar Howard Sturtevant, Barnard College.

Members who intend to be present at the dinner on Friday night and at the luncheon on Saturday are requested to notify, as soon as possible, Professor George D. Kellogg, 10 Nassau Street, Princeton.

### LIFE OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS

Through an oversight proofs of the review by Professor Hendrickson in 4.174-175 were not sent to the author. The following corrections should be made: on page 174, in column 1, line 25, read 'literature' for 'history'; in column 2, line 38, read 'Aleander' for 'Alexander'; in column 2, line 57, read 'imbecility' for 'inability'.

**THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal school holiday, at Teachers College, 535 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is one dollar per year.

*Editor-in-Chief*

GONZALES LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

*Managing Editor*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

*Associate Editors*

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

*Business Manager*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

*Just Published*

**LATIN SIGHT READING—Second Year**

Cloth, 12 mo., 196 pages. Price, 30 cents

Combining the text editions of twenty-five Lives of Nepos, and Episodes from Caesar's Civil War, suited for sight reading in the second year.

*Complete list of sight reading material sent on request*

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

100 Washington Square :: NEW YORK CITY

**HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION**

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, 12 mo. Cloth. xiii+463 pages. \$1.00 net.

*This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.*

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK  
BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO

**REVISED EDITION**

**BARSS' WRITING LATIN**

Based on Lodge's "Vocabulary of High School Latin."

"A pronounced advance beyond the first edition, and will prove useful in many schools."—D. O. S. Lowell, Headmaster Roxbury Latin School. Cloth 144 Pages. 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

231-241 West 39th St., New York

**CAESAR'S FIRST CAMPAIGN**

*A Beginner's Latin Book*

By WILLIAM A. JERNER and HENRY E. WILSON of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

*Illustrated 12mo, Cloth, \$1.00*

*A Solution of the Problem of Making First-Year Work in Latin Interesting and Valuable in Itself.*

**SPECIAL FEATURES**

Geographical and Historical Setting. Drill in Use of a List of 500 Caesarean Words. Excellent and Pertinent Illustrations

**D. APPLETON AND COMPANY**

New York

Chicago

**JUST PUBLISHED**

**THE ESSENTIALS OF LATIN SYNTAX**

*By Charles Christopher Mierow*

Instructor in Classics in Princeton University

**PRICE, 90 CENTS**

This book presents a rapid survey of Latin syntax as an organized whole. It includes exercises for Latin writing based on Caesar and Livy. As a review of Grammar it is an especially valuable handbook for students in advanced classes in preparatory schools and the first year of college.

**GINN AND COMPANY**

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

**JUST PUBLISHED**

**A LATIN GRAMMAR**

By H. E. BURTON, Ph.D., *Professor of Latin*  
*Dartmouth College*

337 Pages

Ninety cents

This is a unique text because it is the only book on the market today which is sufficiently clear and simple for the beginner and also sufficiently complete and scholarly for the college student. It has been critically examined by experienced teachers and professors, who are unanimous in their praises.

**SPECIAL POINTS OF EXCELLENCE**

Its live, vigorous quality, which is due to the fact that its author views Latin as a living language.

Its treatment of the formation of words under the separate parts of speech.

Its clear arrangement, uniform numbering of sections and lack of confusing sub-divisions.

Its effective method of showing the relative importance of the facts stated.

*Write for further information*

**SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY**

NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO